DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 293 522 IR 013 046

AUTHOR Jenkins, Patricia
TITLE Definitions and Re-Defining Media Studies in Further Education: The New Curricula, Media Studies and State Control.
PUB DATE Jul 86
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the International Television Studies Conference (London, England, July 10-12, 1986).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Films; History; *Mass Media; Qualifications; *State Agencies; Student Development; Television Research; Unemployment; *Vocational Education; *Young Adults
IDENTIFIERS *England; *Media Education; State Control

ABSTRACT

This paper, which explores the efforts made by teachers and others in England to promote the study of the media in formal education structures, begins by presenting a brief introductory overview of key historical events in media studies that have affected its identity and evolution. The paper investigates, in particular, post-16 further education in terms of the influence of the state in redefining media education, including its function, its curriculum content, and its pedagogic methodology. The central problem in media studies is addressed by examining the dichotomy between a teachers' fight for access to resources and curriculum space for media studies by constructing a syllabus or recommending the adoption of an already existing syllabus, and gaining curriculum space within other studies, e.g., English, sociology, or general or liberal studies. It is recommended that continued efforts be made to establish the study of the mass media as a valid and serious area of work, and to raise the profile of media studies nationally. A selected chronology of vocational education and related policy events from 1851 through 1982 is appended. (17 references) (CGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED293522

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

DEFINITIONS AND RE-DEFINING MEDIA STUDIES IN FURTHER EDUCATION: THE NEW CURRICULA, MEDIA STUDIES AND STATE CONTROL.

Paper Presented to the 1986 International Television Studies Conference.

by

Patricia Jenkins

IR013046

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert Paterson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Breaking New Ground: Finding a Foothold, of Fitting a Mould?

It cannot be denied that the study of the mass media has fought battles for nigh on thirty years to establish itself as a valid and 'serious' area of work. The reasons are various, stemming from a dominant (and although now in decline, still powerful) notion of what constitutes 'art' and what functions it has in society, which blossoms as a dismissal and distrust of popular - and particularly 'mass produced' forms of expression, such as cinema, television and the press. This in turn is reinforced by the way in which formal education organises knowledge into separate, compartmentalised subjects and subject categories within a hierarchy which values some forms of knowledge and expression of knowledge above others, and which structures its content usually around the achievements of 'great men'. The battles have been fought hard, by individual teachers within individual institutions and by the efforts of bodies such as the British Film Institute Education Department and the Society for Education in Film and Television, and the struggle is succeeding in raising the profile nationally of media studies. More and more schools and colleges have added media studies in some form to their curriculum offer, and in Scotland media studies is official policy - a curriculum fact. Even the establishment is recognising its potential educative qualities: in 1982 the Secretary of State for Education commissioned Her Majesty's Inspectors to convene a meeting of teachers which produced the Department of Education and Science Report, Popular TV and Schoolchildren. This has resulted in the organisation of media education regional groups of teachers and parents throughout England. On a local level, in Inner London the Inspectorate

is taking a great interest in media studies, particularly in further and higher education, and is keen for teachers to define more clearly the subject area. The forms and implications of such establishment recognition will be explored later. Now perhaps we should question the motives behind the struggle by teachers to promote the study of the media in formal education structures: was institutional acceptance and adoption <u>really</u> what we have been fighting for?

A brief overview of historical moments in media studies might prove a useful insight to the current situation for media studies in formal education. I will try hard not to produce a coherent linear narrative of this history around 'great names' (it has been done many times before in any case), but instead identify key movements which have affected the identity and evolution of media studies, particularly in sixteen and post sixteen education. It is perhaps simplistic to say that media studies started as film studies, but the effect of differentiating between cinema and other popular forms in the late 50s, when higher education was allowing some space for film study, has dogged the progress of media studies ever since: you have only to look at the number of courses and conferences entitled "film and media studies" to draw that conclusion. Indeed, Nicholas Garnham identified this problem in the BFI/University of London Institute of Education 1979 Conference entitled "Film and Media Studies in Higher Education", asserting categorically that, because of this division, "our field of study is in a mess"(1). He goes on to claim that the identification of film as an area

separate to media studies makes it by implication more worthy of study.

So why has the evolution of media studies found it necessary to come through film studies? The dominant cultural influence on the ways of discerning the functions of art seems to come from what is commonly referred to as a Leavisite position - that is, that there is such as thing as 'great art', which is the direct and personal expression of the individual, offering a critique and moral stance on society. As Cook and Hillier(2) point out, the study of a mass medium would therefore be impossible to be pure to this approach, being products of industries involving collaberative work. In addition, the notion of a 'great tradition' of art which places emphasis on selected texts is highly evaluative and even discredits other cultural products. Film study, then, adopted this evaluative, individualist, moralist Leavisite approach by classifying selected cinema products and calling them 'art' (usually European, subtitled films) and organising the study of such products around an individual - the director of the film. This was one way of making the study of a mass medium acceptable as an academic discipline - by identifying a 'great tradition' created by 'great artists'. The other way in which film study began to become acceptable as a curriculum item can be attributed to the developments within the media industries which, as Nicholas Garnham has pointed out, "have led to the concrete marginalisation of a cultural practice (namely film-going), to an accompanying shift in the social base for this mode of cultural consumption and thus to the legitimisation of that shift within the educational system. That is to say that film has become available as an object of study prec-

-isely to the extent that it has ceased to be a centrally important medium of mass cultural production and distribution"(3).

The next landmark to consider is the Newsom Report, written at a time of great curriculum reform of which it has been said was the most important institutional factor permitting growth of film and television studies in secondary schools and further education. The Newsom Report, set up in 1961 and published in 1963, was "to consider the education between the ages of 13 and 16 of pupils of average or less than average ability, who are or will be following full time courses either at school or in establishments of further education"(4).

Newsom saw film and television as a powerful social force which teachers had to take into account by training children to "look critically and discriminate between what is good and bad in what they see". The potential of film and television was seen in terms of extending beyond the classroom into the 'real world'. Practical film-making was regarded positively because it would encourage the application of skills in English, science, maths and other basic areas of schooling. Somehow, what kind of films should be made, using what forms, and under what conditions was not seen to be a problem. Again, the cultural justification for accepting the study of film and television in formal education took the form of a protective, evaluative stance: it said that popular television and film was inherently damaging; that half of the population of average and below average ability would be prime targets for media manipulation unless they are taught how to evaluate the product and view discriminatively.

So in higher academia, the institutionalisation of film study was to select and label certain kinds of film product as 'art' and attribute to it the lofty principles of Leavisite literary criticism, whilst in schools and colleges of further education, the study of film and television was seen as a useful teaching tool, a 'window on the world' if pupils were instructed in the selection of 'good' products, and a way of enriching the lives of those who were not equipped to tackle 'real' academic work. A space for media studies is created, but at once delineated and evaluated by the nature of the curriculum space, the system of identifying the subject content, the audience for which it is meant and the mode of accreditation for the study of the subject.

This has happened time and time again since Newsom in the development of media studies. The Bullock Report moves further towards emphasising the notion of 'studying' the media and evolving a critical approach, but still the foundations for these assertions are the same: evaluatige and encouraging 'appreciation' - the ability to recognise and revere 'good media product' - rather than analytical. Paragraph 22.14 of the report encapsulates this. It says, "....a school should use (television) as a disseminator of experience.....developing a critical approach (which places) the emphasis on extending and deepening the pupil's appreciation...."(5)

The most recent intervention, the Department of Education and Science Report, Popular Television and Schoolchildren, although moving much further towards what one might want to see in terms of a State definition of media studies - it goes some way towards acknowledging the 'educational' potential in popular television programmes and talks of the media in terms of its representation of social groups - still has as its basis a moral concern for the welfare of children exposed to popular television, as Tana Wollen points out: "Teachers, parents and programme makers should collaberate, cognisant of their responsibilities as educators all, to ensure that the influences of popular television are beneficial".(6)

The central problem, though, as I see it, is based around this dichotomy: either teachers fight for access to resources and curriculum space for media studies, which usually means at best constructing a syllabus for approval by an examination board, or at worst adopting an already existant syllabus in order to give the bid for resources credance with those in power to allocate them. This is also, in a school timetable which depends so strongly on the acquisition of qualifications, important for students, wish to be credited for work they do. The alternative is to teach in other spaces, for example within English or sociology, or within general and liberal studies. This allows more freedom in terms of what is taught, how it is taught, and to whom, but suffers from devaluation in the eyes of the establishment and in the eyes of students, because it is not identified, resourced or given a means of accreditation. Better access to media studies in institutions of education means compliance with the bourgeois structures of syllabus, mode of delivery and mode

of assessment - what is valued as 'useful' or 'appropriate' knowledge is what is rewarded with time, expertise and a tradeable qualification for students entering the world of work or higher education.

James Donald articulates this dilemma in a BFI Advisory Document which provides a Mode III CSE Syllabus in media studies constructed for Mayfield School (7), and a justification for the syllabus. Donald states that it was less problematic to identify initially what the course did not aim to do and rejects the conservative, Leavisite notion of 'innoculation' against the products of a diseased society, the liberal-progressive stress on teaching students to be more effective consumers of media messages, and the notion of vocational, technical training. Instead he identifies a general but central objective to be the "investigation and revelation of ideology in practice"(8).

Acknowledging that, because the education system is as much a distributor of dominant ideology, the creation of 'oppositional space' in the curriculum which challenges dominant practice is necessary, rather than definition of a discrete subject area, and offering it on a platter to the system. Don't forget, he warns, that diffusion and reabsorbtion through naturalising contradictions is the subtlest and most effective way of suppressing threats to hegemony. However, Donald, like so many teachers of media studies in the late 1970s and early 80s, is forced to compromise by constructing a teacher-controlled syllabus, and offers guidelines for 'oppositional education' (9).

Although by way of introduction I have offered nothing like a history of the subject area, this random selection of events does begin to identify the problem. Media Studies has had a chequered career, illustrating the shifts it has had to contend with, from its elitist conception in higher education in the late 1950s, to its role as entertainment for low achievers in secondary schools; from its notable political advances in teacher controlled Mode III CSE and GCE syllabi to its equally notable political retreats in vocational, skills-based training in further education. It's a traveller with many and varied stamps in the passport, acquired whilst traversing the heavily guarded frontiers of the ation system in Britain.

Further Education: Eliminating the Opportunity to Create Oppositional Space?

> "All Ideological State Apparatuses, whatever they are, contribute ~~to the same result:~~ the reproduction of the relations of production, i.e. of capitalist relations of exploitation.....one Ideological State Apparatus certainly has the dominant role, although hardly anyone lends an ear to its music: it is so silent! This is the school.
>
> It takes children from every class at infant school age, and then for years....it drums into them..... a certain amount of 'know how' wrapped in the ruling ideology (French, arithmetic, natural history, the sciences, literature) or simply the ruling ideology (ethics, civic instruction, philosophy). Somewhere around the age of sixteen, a huge mass of children are ejected 'into production': these are the workers or small peasants. Another proportion of scholastically adapted youth carries on: and for better or for worse it goes somewhat further until it falls by the wayside and fills the posts of small and middle technicians, white collar workers, small and middle executives.....a last proportion reaches the summit either to fall into intellectual semi-employment .....or to provide the agents of exploitation (capitalists, managers) the agentsof repression (...politicians, administrators etc) and the professional ideologists."(10)

It is post-sixteen, further education that I want to examine in particular in terms of the influence of the State in redefining media studies - its function, its curriculum content and its pedagogic methodology. This strata of the education system is important for a variety of reasons, not least of all in terms of the influence of the curriculum at this level on that which is developed in pre-sixteen education. Secondly, although further education would appear to be less 'controlled' than schooling, in that it is non-compulsory, the choices that are presented to sixteen year olds are few and far between. Some choose to continue the academic route with GCE Advanced Level courses; others wish to go straight into employment, but are lucky if they find any. That leaves the dole queue, or two options: either a 'second chance' to sit GCE O' levels or CSEs, continuing general education; or the opportunity to join a pre-vocational or vocational course.

The chances of finding an 'oppositional space' in any of these options are minimal. At this stage of the game, time for students is of the essence: they have only so long to gain either the qualifications that they failed at school, or to replace them with alternative qualifications. For this reason students value, and therefore attend only those parts of their courses that lead directly to the examination hall. In vocational courses, this is even more pronounced, since what students have traded is education for 'training'. There have been many debates asserting that the essential difference

behind these two concepts is that education provides a broadening experience, whilst training by definition limits and defines more acutely the learning experience. Appendix One gives a more detailed account of the evolution of vocational training and the ideological implications of such schemes. There is, it seems, a great deal of substance to what seems to be perhaps a rather paranoic notion of state conspiracy which affects the nature of education in terms of availability, content, mode of delivery and mode of accreditation. The overall tendency of the State in taking on responsibility for post-sixteen education, and particularly vocational education, is not surprising, given its increased role in monopoly capitalism. Those modes of education that are now well established in further education colleges through the influence of the Manpower Services Commission such as B/TEC, YTS, City & Guilds, and CPVE can be clearly defined as functional and closely related to the restructuring of capital.

The need for a flexible workforce, equipped with transferrable skills, is the need of an advanced capitalist society in Marxian terms:

> "The more highly capitalist production is developed in a country, the greater the demand will be for <u>versatility</u> in labour power, the more indifferent the worker will be towards the <u>specific content</u> of his work and the more fluid will be the movements of capital from one sphere of production to the next." (11)

Flexibility implies an acceptance, a non-questionning approach to one's role in a capitalist system: it is the notion of keeping the cogs of the wheel oiled and turning without disrupting

to ask how they work.

Although we cannot deny the presence of the hidden curriculum in non-vocational courses at sixteen-plus, there is at least more opportunity to stray from the pack. The fact remains that there is a two tier education structure affirmed at the post-sixteen stage, which bears an uncanny resemblance to the two tier education structure that began in the nineteenth century and continued until the emergence of comprehensive education - another example of this government's commitment to Victorian values. Lawton notes in his work, Social Change, Educational Theory and Curriculum Planning, that

> "..we would do well to remember that the public school curriculum (from which the State grammar school curriculum was derived), was intended for the education of an elite: knowledge suitable for the ruling class, especially of the classics, was the basis of the curriculum. On the other hand, nineteenth century elementary education was a frankly inferior kind of training, designed to produce good, obedient citizens, useful workers just literate enough to follow simple instructions and possibly to read passages from the Bible." (12)

To claim that current vocational and academic provision in further education parallel's Lawson's nineteenth century model might seem a little extreme, yet clear likenesses are apparent. Although most people can read and write, the kind of literacy denied them in training schemes is that which teaches them to read the structures of dominant ideology, so that they are able to look to change those power relationships.

Media Studies: Education and Training in Further Education

There are many definitions of media studies. Some still think of it as a means of teaching how to appreciate and recognise 'good' television and film products; others are about media technology; some are about the acquisition of practical skills. But the definition that is shared by those of us who wish to see the subject as a means to educate politically, to demystify the power relations within our society - as 'oppositional curriculum' - would probably go along with David Lusted's notoin of television education as critical study. This can be applied more generally to media studies and media education in terms of the ideological values expressed in the description offered in TV and Schooling(13), which states that the study of the media should be

> "..the acquisition and use of practices of production and skills of analysis. Importantly, these skills and practices are to be seen as integrated so that learners know where they come from and how they fit together. The object is to come to know arguments about the status of what are to be seen as different styles of practice and analysis whose consequence constitutes (media studies) as an object of study in different ways. Such a course of study should include applying types of textual and social analysis, discerning different aesthetic practices, investigating (mass media) history and its institutions. And also, and importantly again, exploring the various social and cultural understandings that we have of the (mass media). (14)

Unfortunately, what we have in further education can only go some way to achieving this ideal. Academic courses of study followed at present include O' level Film Studies and O'Level Modern Communications and Photography, and A' Level Film Studies and Communication Studies. Film Studies O' level, although the most established accredited mode of study of the media at this

rooted in the moment of its construction in terms of its main areas of study and its form of accreditation. Although teacher controlled - it is a Mode III course - it nevertheless bases the coursework around auteur and genre theory, and examines the Industry and an option study in one 2½ hour paper. Although one would hope that the four sections of the course would overlap in the teaching, the form of accreditation encourages the separation of these areas of study. The fact that auteurism still has a place smacks of the evaluative, Leavisite approach to high and popular culture mentioned earlier.

Modern Communications is to all intents and purposes a television O' level, but it offers no space for textual analysis. Candidates are asked to comment on television product only in terms of technical merit and 'appropriate' use of visual or sound techniques. The practical work that students are asked to engage with - the production of a video programme over a six month period - is assessed in terms of its value as 'good' television adhering closely to professional practice. The process the students go through in the production of their video is not examined, just the product. Students demonstrate the ability to use dominant television codes and any attempt to oppose these conventions, or innovate, is questionned by the examiner in terms of its 'appropriateness'. Similarly, although there is a history and institution section on the examination paper, the questions are usually to do with the content of government reports, or technical innovations, and are dislocated

in general from product. The course is about learning 'good practice'. Moreover, with the pressures in further education to vocationalise, often GCE subjects are put together to form subject related vocational packages. A media studies O level package would therefore consist of usually film studies, modern communications and photography. This would be a one-year course in further education. Since the three subject areas have evolved in terms of curriculum from different cultural perspectives, a common conceptual and philisophical base does note exist, which serves to reinforce the notion that these three subjects are discrete areas of study, which bear no relevance to each other, or to the student, outside the requirements of formal education. Naturally, one can and does 'teach atainst' the syllabus - but at the end of the day, students have to pass the exam, so there are limits to the amount of 'oppositional' space available.

Taking over from GCE and CSE examinations will be the G.C.S.E. With a brief to cross the ability range, with the original intention of avoiding early 'setting' into differentiated or ability groups, the G.C.S.E. perhaps seems a welcome replacement. Indeed, many media studies teachers have taken the opportunity to submit reformulated syllabi which include more of the concerns radical teachers would wish to aim for. However, the implications of the coming of the G.C.S.E. in general do not necessarily seem so positive: the curriculum has been redefined by central government yet again, by the implementation of national criteria for twenty major G.C.S.E. subjects - media studies is not one of them.

G.C.S.E. is in any case unlikely to be taken up in any major way by the colleges of further education. It is vocational and pre-vocational training, validated by such bodies as B/TEC and City and Guilds, who are answerable to the Department of Employment, not the Department of Education, that is being encouraged in replacement of more general education at sixteen plus. Training, by the very nature of its specificity, has fewer opportunities to develop oppositional curriculum space: liberal studies within most training schemes has been replaced by "social and life skills" - i.e. a means of imposing correct and appropriate attitudinal skills training to, as one MSC publication put it, enable young people to "get on with the boss".

In terms of media studies, such an approach can serve to redefine the area to an alarming extent, by changing the emphasis from critical analysis to the acquisition of 'appropriate' skills. This might be by using practical work to acquire technical, operational skills, or to use video production to enable students to assess their own attitudinal qualities in, say, role-play interview practice. A media studies subject specific course has more implications. An example in practice is the City and Guilds validated Media Techniques 779 (radio and journalism) Certificate ([redacted]), which purports to approach the study of the media in a skills based, 'professional' manner. I will risk becoming anecdotal here to illustrate how a vocational, skills based approach can drastically redefine media studies, and reverse its politics.

A meeting for interested parties considering offering the 779 Media Techniques certificate at the oak-pannelled premises of the validating institution with those who had set up and piloted the course revealed that the critical study of the media was certainly not the intention of the course. (It might also be worth adding here, at the risk of sounding neurotic, that on my visits to the said institution, I am frequently the only female participant in such meetings, or one of a very few; have been mistaken for the minute taker once or twice; and often only see other women dressed in black dresses and white pinnies, bearing food or drink to besuited men. I say this as a further indication of the ideology of the institution!) Comments included claims that the intention was to provide a 'high quality' foundation to the current NCTJ (National Council for the Training of Journalists) foundation course, and that participants should be aiming to produce radio programmes and journalism rather than 'waffling' about them: a fairly obvious condemnation of media studies as radical teachers would wish to perceive it! It was also emphasised that practical work should be of a high professional and technical standard. Firstly, it is questionable - even unlikely - that colleges would be equipped with professional standard recording apparatus and print facilities. How is 'professional' being defined anyway? It seems that this course seeks to encourage reproduction of mainstream radio and journalism techniques and gives credit to such reproduction. So would an avant garde or alternative mode of practice be discredited for being 'unprofessional'?

Does a course, then, which demonstrates an apparent lack of interest in and commitment to anything but production for mainstream media outlets provide a satisfactory intervention

in the vocational/pre-vocational curriculum space? Certainly it is a start that a space exists, and the syllabus can be effectively taught "against". But what is the point of teaching against the grain when students will receive credit only for commitment to 'professional' mainstream media products?

It might be argued that such a course provides access to the means of media production for young people; but which young people? Those capable of two A level subjects in addition to the Media Techniques certificate - those capable of receiving what Michael Young refers to as 'high status knowledge'; to those used to and happy to be rewarded for individual rather than collective achievement. It is indicative that the ideals of promoting 'professional' journalists and radio journalists have been formulated and the 779 scheme piloted in rural and home counties areas. Why should a young black living in an inner city area even desire to become trained to reproduce the values and standards of the media which constantly and consistently works to produce negative and racist images, maintaining white middle class male hegemony?

So what is wrong with producing a vocational course which is critical and analytical of the mainstream media, which encourages collective and alternative modes of production and does not denounce them as 'unprofessional'? (15)

There is not space to analyse other vocational syllabi here (16), but the political implications behind the redefinition of media studies as vocational training can be clearly seen. It is,

after all, no coincidence that major developments in further education by the Manpower Services Commission have taken place with the rise of long term unemployment and, in particular, youth unemployment. The main reason for youth unemployment is not that young workers have worse qualifications than older workers, and therefore need training - in fact, in general, they have <u>better</u> qualifications. Nor is it because there are more young people than ever before. It is because the jobs that young people went into no longer exist.

Many potential employment arenas have suffered cutbacks during the economic recession, and with industry's attempts at more 'efficient' capital intensive production, many jobs have disappeared for good. Yet 'youth' has been defined as the problem.

Another factor to bear in mind is that as unemployment increases, the length of time for which young people are unemployed also expands. The transition time from school to work is therefore increasing, an aspect which has been one of the major incentives for mobilizing training with work experience as quickly as possible - the longer the transition time, the greater the likelihood of social unrest, and the more unbridgeable the gap between the qualities of youth turned out by the education system and the qualities of youth required by industry.

The Chairperson of the Manpower Services Commission has explicitely stated that one of his main tasks is to stop the young unemployed becoming "enemies to the society". This being the case, media studies as a discipline which analyses and challenges one of the most powerful Ideological State Apparatus - the mass media -

is hardly likely to form the main emphasis of any MSC funded course! However, the importance of the media as a potential employment arena cannot be denied, and neither can the D.E.S. interest in the study of the media from primary school onwards, its concern being demonstrated by the 1982 commissioned, 1985 published report, Popular TV and Schoolchildren, based on

> "....the concern of teachers and others involved in educational provision about mass media and television in particular.....based on both awareness of their potential as educational tools and anxiety least they be negative influences on the attitudes and behaviour of young people." (17)

It is therefore the case that media specific courses are being invited by B/TEC, CPVE and City and Guilds, and media education is being requested as elements of other such courses. The problem is that the ideology of the validating institutions and the modes of accreditation and assessment, which tens more towards an analysis of achievement by ticks on a list of acquired skills, mediates curriculum content, redefines it and, as a result, narrows it. Although it may be more desireable in some ways to credit students by a series of 'can do' statements rather than by 'norm referencing' where students are judged against each others' performance, it is also possible to argue that much of the driving force behind the New Vocationalism comes from a desire to offer only what is "relevant". In terms of media studies, this might mean only how to operate equipment, or how to reproduce and tehrefore also identify and appreciate 'professional' or 'good' media products (as defined by mainstream institutions). Since the notion of professional practice is related to State cont-

rolled mainstream media institutions, this discourages and discredits oppositional approaches both in terms of practical work and critical work - we are back to evaluation instead of analysis.

That is not to say that interventions cannot be made - after all, syllabus submissions come from teachers to the examination boards. Indeed, attempts have been made within the limitations of the general rubrick laid down by the boards for syllabus construction, to write in some 'oppositional space' - examples can be seen in a recently drafted Television Studies syllabus written by a party of further education lecturers for the City and Guilds of London Institute, and in a draft B/TEC media studies proposal which will be submitted in 1987 for approval. However, it must be said that such interventions at present hardly ripple the surface of a sea of other already validated media skills courses.

The redefinition of media studies by the necessity to gain curriculum space in further education has meant that vocational and pre-vocational course validation has been sought by necessity. A history of wishing to challenge dominant ideological perceptions of the world in which we live has had to be re-written to gain institutional acceptance and resourcing. We must keep making such interventions, but never forgetting that institutionalisation of an area of study which is capable of rocking the ideological boat necessarily means compromise

which can all too quickly mean that the challenge vanishes as the area becomes absorbed, the oppositional approach 'naturalised' until it snugly fits into the curriculum demands mandated by state controlled validating bodies .

REFERENCES

(1) GARNHAM, N. "Film and Media Studies: Reconstructing the subject", in Film and Media Studies in Higher Education, Christine Gledhill (ed)., BFI (1981) p3.

(2) COOK, J and HILLIER, J The Growth of Film and Television Studies 1960 - 75, BFI(1982) Revised Edition, p.2

(3) GARNHAM, N, Ibid, p.4

(4) Quoted in COOK J, and HILLIER, J The Growth of Film and Television Studies 1960 - 75 (BFI 1982), p.5

(5) A Language for Life, Report of the Committee of Inquiry (The Bullock Report), HMSO 1975, Para.22.14 as quoted by David Lusted in TV and Schooling, "A History of Suspicion: Educational Attitudes to Television", ed. LUSTED, D. and DRUMMOND, P., (BFI/Institute of Education 1985), p.16.

(6) WOLLEN, Tana, "Television, Media Studies and Schooling", TV and Schooling (ed. LUSTED, D. and DRUMMOND, P, BFI/ Institute of Education 1985), p.71.

(7) DONALD, James, Media Studies - Possibilities and Limitations (BFI, November 1977).

(8) Ibid. p.2

(9) Ibid. p.7:

Hegemonic Education	Oppositional Education
Knowledge as the accumulation of unitary, interchangeable skills.	Knowledge as the product of human practice.
Education as vocational training with behavioural aims and objectives.	Education as a political learning process.
Education functioning ideologically to reproduce social relations.	Education revealing the ideological formation of consciousness.
External control of the curriculum.	Curriculum development by teachers and pupils in their work together.
Assessment by outside bodies.	Reflexive assessment based on production and use.

Coercive discipline imposed by teacher in preparation for the "discipline of work".	Discipline imposed by collaberative work.
Teacher responsible to hierarchies of authority and professionalism.	Teacher responsible to the mass of working class pupils.

(10) ALTHUSSER, Louis, "Lenin and Philosophy and other Essays", Ideology and the State, N.L.B. (1971) pp.146-9.

(11) MARX, K. Capital, Penguin Edition, pp.1013 - 1014.

(12) LAWTON, D., Social Change, Educational Theory and Curriculum Planning, University ofLondon Press, (1973) p.79

(13) TV and Schooling DRUMMOND, P and LUSTED D BFI/Institute of Education, (1985).

(14) LUSTED, D, "A History of Suspicion: Educational Attitudes to Television", ed. DRUMMOND p and LUSTED, D, TV and Schooling (BFI/Institute of Education, 1985), p.17.

(15) This section is referred to in the F.E. Sector Report in the SEFT Bradford Conference Papers (SEFT 1986, forthcoming).

(16) Other syllabi will be available for perusal at the ITSC.

(17) The D.E.S. Report, Popular TV and Schoolchildren (1985).

APPENDIX 1

CHRONOLOGY OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND RELATED POLICY EVENTS (A SELECTION ONLY)

1851 Great Exhibition - demonstrated Britain's inadequacy in industrial system and failure to train workforce efficiently. State created Dept. of Science & Art - distributed grants for science classes. Needed evaluation of newly educated workforce, therefore examining boards like R.S.A. emerged.

1878 City & Guilds of London Institute for the Advancement of Technical Education founded to educate "young artisans and others in the scientific and artistic branches of ther trades."

1889 Technical Instruction Act - county councils raised a penny rate to promote 'technical and manual instruction' - founding specific technical schools. Expenditure administered by Technical Instruction Committees - led to decentralisation of responsibility for this field.

1902 Education Act to expand evening institutes and establish junior and senior technical schools.

After the war, voluntary (and therefore ineffective) day release schemes were introduced.

1921 National Certificate System introduced - also, this was the first time that the State, the industrial sector and the educational sector had attempted some form of integration in that area.

O.N.C. - Ordinary National Certificate - 3 years.
H.N.C. - Higher National Certificate - 2 years.
Evening class method of study would often extend study time far beyond.

O.N.C./H.N.C. - effective method of socialising labour aristocracy into industrial-technical system.

1950s/1960s Final expansion of technical education - massive increase of further education colleges and polytechnics.

N.B. Traditional division of theory and practice still perpetuated - apprenticeship training still divided into theory, administered by the colleges and practice, responsibility of industry.

1961 White Paper: BETTER OPPORTUNITIES IN FURTHER EDUCATION - attempt to arrange courses "more closely to the needs of industry".

1964 Industrial Training Act - industrial training boards responsible for training within particular industries, financed by levies on each firm. First time education and training attempted integration within colleges.

1972 Raising of school leaving age implemented. Schools Council Humanities Project began reporting. TOPS launched by Training Service Agency.

December - EDUCATION: A FRAMEWORK FOR EXPANSION promised to implement James Report recommendations on in-service training and extend training and other staff support in F.E. colleges.

1973 Employment and Training Act created MSC; new arrangements for supporting apprenticeship and other training; Careers service re-vamped. Russell Report on Adult Education published and considered.

1974 MSC reviews growing unemployment problem: THERE'S WORK TO BE DONE.

1975 Job Creation Programme launched by MSC: young people have preference in selection for ~~employment~~

1976 Unified Vocational Preparation pilot programme launched by DES. E.E.C. announces five year action programme on transition from school to work. Ruskin College speech demanding return to basics plus more vocational relevance.

MSC publishes TOWARDS A COMPREHENSIVE MANPOWER POLICY - co-author, Geoffrey Holland, made chairperson of Holland Working Party on youth unemployment; Work experience programme launched.

1977 Great debate on school education.

Holland Report YOUNG PEOPLE AND WORK - proposes to combine and extend youth employment and training

Youth Opportunities Programme. Accepted immediately by Government.

D.E.S. Working Party on unemployed school leavers recommends continuing UVP as joint programme with MSC.

MSC publishes TRAINING FOR SKILLS: A PROGRAMME FOR ACTION recommending further support to Independent training boards to sustain apprenticeships.

1978 YOP launched with open ended budget.

Further Education Unit (FEU) at DES completes first year's work. priority for Vocational Preparation agreed; study groups on YOP, UVP and one-year pre-voc courses prepare reports.

1979 DES and DE jointly publish 16-18s (Jan) and A BETTER START IN WORKING LIFE (March) in support of new DES proposals for extending voc. prep. and revamping 16-18s provision.

1980 (Nov) James Prior announces in House of Commons that MSC are moving towards a comprehensive one-year youth training programme.

1981 Revised MacFarlane Report Education for 16-19s recommends rationalisation to suit local circumstances.

(July) Riots in most inner cities provoke government response - further strengthening of carrer service, enhancement of YOP, £60m extra to RSG to enable LEAs to expand full time education for 16-19s.

1982 Youth Task Group produces compromise plan for Youth Training Scheme to include some young workers.

(July) Tebbit accepts Task Group report and announces YTS to start September 1983. Pilot schemes to be run 1982-3.

SOURCES:

Unit 12, E222 Open University, Control of Education in Britain Course Team: The Colleges and Schools, Provision for the 16 - 19 year olds.

Proposals for developing a Sixteen Plus Education Centre 1983-1986 - Institute of Education April 1983.
NB Most of the later developments quoted directly from this publication.